REMARKS

The October 6, 2003 Office Action rejected all claims pending in the application under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The present Amendment and Response amends the specification to correct minor typographical errors, amends claims 1, 20, 31 and 39 to clearly define the claimed subject matter, and amends claims 19, 29, 30, 33, 44 and 47 to correct dependencies and antecedent basis errors. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the enclosed amendments and remarks, and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections.

In the Specification

Applicant submits amendments to paragraphs 11, 12 and 25 to correct minor typographical errors discovered in the specification after filing.

In the Claims

All claims, 1-56, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and requests the Examiner to reconsider the Section 102 rejections.

Claims 1-19

Staples et al. Reference

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Staples et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,764,639, issued June 9, 1998. In general, Staples discloses a system for providing a remote user with a virtual presence at a corporate office. The remote user establishes the virtual presence by connecting to the office using a computer system 102. System 102 includes an individual remote worker (IRW) unit 104 (FIG. 2) which provides transparent telephone and data connectivity and virtual presence to the corporate office. IRW 104 couples to a virtual presence server 106 through the PSTN using conventional analog or ISDN transmission (i.e. conventional "dial-up" techniques). The virtual presence server 106 interfaces to PBX 112 and LAN 114. Thus, the remote user can perform certain functions and receive incoming calls as if the user were physically present in the office.

In contrast to Staples, Applicant's amended claim 1 recites a web server programmed to provide *a dynamic web-based graphical user interface*...*a web-based communication channel* coupling said communication device and said information center to cause a remote access session, whereby, said communication device initiates said session *by accessing said dynamic web-based GUI*...thereby *transferring complete management functions of said information indicative of said telephone call to said communication device.*

Staples fails to teach, suggest or disclose a *web-based* remote access session whereby, a communication device initiates the session by *accessing a dynamic web-based GUI*. Staples discloses that the virtual presence server 106 may also include a "remote access server 108 and/or bridge router for performing more conventional remote access functions" (*see e.g.*, column 5, lines 23-29). However, Staples does not disclose that server 108 is a "web server" or is any way coupled to a "web-based communication channel" so that web-based connections with the remote user are possible. Rather, Staples suggests that server 108 is merely a component of the virtual presence server 106 and therefore is coupled to the remote user through the PSTN. Additionally, Staples discloses that in the preferred embodiment, the virtual presence software presents a graphical user interface (GUI) on the screen, including an icon titled "Be There" (*see e.g.*, column 16, lines 65-67). The GUI disclosed by Staples *is not* a "dynamic *web-based* GUI" as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Staples does not disclose that the GUI is or can be supported by web-based protocol because Staples does not disclose a "web-based" system.

Moreover, Staples fails to teach, suggest or disclose *transferring complete management functions of the information indicative of a telephone call to the communication device*.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Staples fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's independent claim 1 and thus, respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection. By virtue of their dependence to claim 1, claims 2-19 include all of the elements of claim 1 and therefore, Staples fails to anticipate each of claims 2-19. Additionally, claims 2-19 include subject matter not disclosed in Staples. For example, Staples fails to teach, suggest or disclose that

during a remote access session the telephone is inoperable as recited in Applicant's claim 8 and further that the telephone displays a notification of the inoperable state as recited in claim 19; a phantom extension as recited in claim 9; and PBX-type messaging as recited in claims 10, 11 and 13-16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections to claims 2-19.

Applicant further submits that none of the references considered by the Examiner, including Begeja '094, teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of claims 1-19 either alone or in combination. Also, filed herewith is an information disclosure statement containing U.S. Patent No. 6,141,545, issued October 31, 2000 to Begeja et at., which is a parent-in-part of Begeja '094 cited by the Examiner. Although not cited by the Examiner, Applicant submits that Begeja '545 fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of claims 1-19. For instance, Begeja '094 and '545 fail to teach, suggest or disclose initiating a remote session by accessing a "dynamic *web-based* GUI" and "*transferring complete management functions of said information indicative of said telephone call to said communication device.*"

Claims 20-56

Begeja et al. Reference

Claims 20-56 stand rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by Begeja et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,571,094, issued May 27, 2003. In general, Begeja discloses a system for remote *call forwarding* of telephone calls *from an IP connection, such as from an IP terminal 112*. The user enters a feature code from his personal computer (i.e. IP terminal 112) or other Internet workstation to a web page displaying *call forwarding* activation data. A Service Control Point (SCP 106) recognizes the feature code as a request to invoke the remote call forwarding feature on the user's wire-line telephone so that calls directed to that wire-line are forwarded to, e.g., a cellular phone 103 (*see e.g.*, Begeja Abstract). "An object of the [Begeja] present invention is to *invoke a remote call forwarding feature for a subscriber's wire-line telephone from the subscriber's home or business phone to the subscriber's cellular phone from an IP connection*" (column 3, lines 17-20). In other words, Begeja '094 requires the user to invoke or cause the remote call forwarding feature from another terminal or phone and

not the remote device to which calls are to be forwarded to. Additionally, Begeja only discloses a *call forwarding* feature.

Claims 20-30

In contrast to Begeja, Applicant's amended claim 20 recites *a messaging server* configured to receive, store and cause a textual display of a telephone-related event...a web server programmed to provide *a dynamic GUI website*...the remote device configured to access the website via the world wide web and *cause the remote access session between the remote device and the office center*, during the session, *the remote device receiving the textual display of the event via the dynamic GUI website* on the remote device display, *the function key enabling a management of the event within the office center.*

Begeja fails to teach, disclose or suggest *a messaging server* as recited in Applicant's claim 20. In fact, Begeja fails to disclose *messaging* features at all and therefore would have no need for a *messaging server*. In addition, Begaja fails to disclose a *dynamic GUI website* or *a remote device receiving the textual display of the event via the dynamic GUI website*. Begeja discloses a *static* website available for information gathering purposes only, such as entry of a feature code to invoke the call forwarding feature. Begeja fails to disclose that the *remote device receives the textual display of the event via the dynamic GUI website* because the website disclosed in Begeja is a static site used only to invoke the call forward feature and is not used once the call forward is set up. Begeja further fails to teach, disclose or suggest *a function key (of the remote device) enables management of the event within the office center*. Begeja only teaches forwarding calls to the subscriber's cellular telephone and fails to disclose *any* functions available to the subscriber from the cellular device for management of the call back at the office. Moreover, Begeja '094 fails to disclose that it is the *remote device that accesses a website to cause the remote access session*. Rather, Begeja '094 discloses that another terminal or phone invokes the call forwarding feature on behalf of the remote device.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Begeja fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's independent claim 20 and thus, respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection. By virtue of their dependence to claim 20,

claims 21-30 include all of the elements of claim 20 and therefore, Begeja fails to anticipate each of claims 21-30. Additionally, claims 21-30 include subject matter not disclosed in Begeja. For example, Begeja fails to teach, suggest or disclose an OAI link as recited in Applicant's claims 24-26; that the event comprises a voice mail message as recited in claim 27; and a command from the messaging server to the PBX system to disable the communication device (i.e., wire-line telephone) within the office center as recited in claim 30. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections to claims 21-30.

Claims 31-38

In contrast to Begeja, Applicant's amended claim 31 recites *a dynamic GUI website* and *during a remote access session, a web-compliant portable communication device displays the dynamic GUI website.*

For some of the same reasons as stated above, Begeja fails to teach, suggest or disclose *a dynamic GUI website that is displayed on the device during a remote session*. For example, Begeja discloses access to a *static* website as one embodiment to invoke call forwarding, thus the website is not used once the call forward feature is set up. Furthermore, the website *is not* displayed on the portable communication device that receives the forwarded calls, but rather Begeja discloses using another device such as an IP terminal to invoke the feature.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Begeja fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's independent claim 31 and thus, respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection. By virtue of their dependence to claim 31, claims 32-38 include all of the elements of claim 31 and therefore, Begeja fails to anticipate each of claims 32-38. Additionally, claims 32-38 include subject matter not disclosed in Begeja. For example, Begeja fails to teach, suggest or disclose an IPC comprising a plurality of appearances corresponding to an equal number of office telephones as recited in Applicant's claims 35-36; that conversion software is downloaded from a web server to the communication device as recited in claim 37; and a phantom extension as recited in claim 38. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections to claims 32-38.

Claims 39-56

In contrast to Begeja, Applicant's amended claim 39 recites *constructing a web page model of said telephone viewable on said remote client, comprising a representation of a plurality of functions available on said telephone...and updating said telephone functions in accordance with any alterations made from said web page model of said telephone displayed on said remote client.*

Begeja fails to teach, suggest or disclose *constructing a web page model of said telephone viewable on said remote client.* In one embodiment of Begeja, the user may access a web site of the user's IP service provider and presumptively view a web page. The web page *is not a model of a telephone coupled to an office information center,* but rather, is "a user screen for activating remote call featuring" by inputting a feature code such as "*37" (*see* column 5, lines 38-45). Moreover, Begeja fails to teach, suggest or disclose *updating said telephone functions in accordance with any alterations made from said web page model of said telephone displayed on said remote client.* Begeja discloses invoking only call forwarding from an IP terminal or the user's home, and does not disclose updating any function of the office-coupled telephone made from a web page model of the telephone displayed on the remote client.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Begeja fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's independent claim 39 and thus, respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection. By virtue of their dependence to claim 39, claims 40-56 include all of the elements of claim 39 and therefore, Begeja fails to anticipate each of claims 40-56. Additionally, claims 40-56 include subject matter not disclosed in Begeja. For example, Begeja fails to teach, suggest or disclose establishing a link to a messaging server or routing voice mail messages as recited in Applicant's claims 41-43 and 48-49,respectively; compressing data representative of an incoming call as recited in claim 44; translating an incoming call to a packet for transmission as recited in claim 47; disabling the functions available on the telephone and displaying notification of the same as recited in claims 50, 54-55; and establishing a link to the world wide web by activating a pre-programmed function key on the remote client as recited in claim 53. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the

withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections to claims 40-56.

Begeja '545 reference

Although not cited by the Examiner, Applicant has reviewed U.S. Patent No. 6,141,545 issued to Begeja et al. on October 31, 2000, which is a parent-in-part of Begeja '094 referenced by the Examiner. In general, Begeja '545 discloses a similar system for remote call forwarding of telephone calls as Begeja '094; however, Begeja '545 discloses the remote call forwarding feature can be enabled by dialing a feature code from the cellular phone, thereby requesting calls directed to his wire-line to be forwarded to that cellular phone.

Similar to Begeja '094, Begeja '545 fails to teach, disclose or suggest a *messaging server, the remote device receiving the textual display of the telephone-related event via the dynamic GUI website, and a function key (of the remote device) enabling a management of the telephone-related event*, as recited in Applicant's claims 20-30. In addition, Begeja '545 fails to disclose *accessing a website via the world wide web and causing the remote access session between the remote device and the office center* , as further recited in Applicant's claims 20-30. In fact, Begeja '545 fails to disclose a *web-based* remote access system at all.

With respect to Applicant's claims 31-38, Begeja '545 fails to teach, disclose or suggest *a dynamic GUI website that is displayed on the web-compliant portable communication device during a remote session.*

Begeja '545 further fails to teach, disclose or suggest *constructing a web page model of the telephone viewable on the remote client* and *updating the telephone functions in accordance with any alternations made from the web page model displayed on the remote client* as recited in Applicant's claims 39-56.

Accordingly, Applicant submits all claims pending in the application are patentably distinct over Begeja '545.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the enclosed amendments to the specification and the claims, withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections to claims 1-56, and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance. No new matter is being submitted. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the application, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
Inter-Tel, Inc.

Date: 12-30-03

By: Michelle Whittington
Michelle R. Whittington, Esq.
Intellectual Property Counsel
Reg. No. 43,844

INTER-TEL, INC.
7300 W. Boston St.
Chandler, AZ 85226
Direct: (480) 961-9000 x21352
Facsimile:(480) 961-8073
Email: michelle_whittington@inter-tel.com